

Mortgage Foreclosure Best Practices

Senate Enrolled Act 492, codified at I.C. 32-30-10.5 *et seq.*, gave defendants in residential mortgage foreclosure actions the right to request a settlement conference. Since this statute took effect on July 1, 2009, the Indiana Supreme Court Division of State Court Administration has had opportunity to observe the functions and results of settlement conferences – both under the statute and under the Mortgage Foreclosure Trial Court Assistance Project’s (MFTCAP) pilot program, administered by State Court Administration.

While this legislation was well-intentioned, it did leave a few gaps. Working through the settlement conference process, both in MFTCAP pilot and non-pilot counties, has taught us a few things. With these in mind, here are some recommended steps and best practices in dealing with mortgage foreclosure actions. To produce these best practices, the Division of State Court Administration consulted with creditors’ attorneys, defendants’ attorneys, academics, MFTCAP facilitators, and trial judges. These practices have not been reviewed by the Indiana Supreme Court. However, they were developed in consultation with Indiana trial judges, academics, and other experts in creditor-debtor law, along with the Office of the Indiana Attorney General and the Division of State Court Administration.

These best practices are designed to be a guideline for the processing of mortgage foreclosure proceedings and are not “set in stone.” Changes, innovations and suggestions are welcome and may be directed to Elizabeth Daulton at edaulton@courts.state.in.us or (317) 234-7155.

PLEADING DISCLAIMER: The negotiable instrument “best practices” apply to pleadings only, and not to the standard of proof required by the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC). Either the Defendant or the Court may require the Plaintiff to prove (A) possession of the original promissory note, and (B) that Plaintiff qualifies under I.C. 26-1-3.1-301(1) or (2) or (3), and other applicable law, such as trust law.

Under I.C. 3.1-301(1), to be a “holder” (as defined in I.C. 26-1-1-201), the Plaintiff must be in possession of the original promissory note which is either endorsed in blank or is endorsed specifically to the Plaintiff. As long as signatures are valid and (if applicable) there is a clear chain of endorsements to the Plaintiff or to an endorsement in blank, there is a presumption the holder, by producing the instrument, is entitled to enforce the note, subject to valid defenses.

Under I.C. 3.1-301(2), to be a “non-holder” (as defined in I.C. 26-1-3.1-203), the Plaintiff must be in possession of the original promissory note, but unlike I.C. 301(1), the note would not be endorsed in blank or endorsed to the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff would have the burden to prove (without benefit of a presumption) a chain of title to establish the fact that it has the right to enforce the note (i.e., that Plaintiff is a “non-holder” under I.C. 3.1-203), subject to valid defenses (*see* I.C. 3.1-203 comment 2).

Under I.C. 3.1-301(3), to be entitled to enforce a lost note, the person seeking enforcement must prove the terms of the instrument and the person’s right to enforce the instrument. In addition, the person required to pay the note must be adequately protected against loss that might occur by reason of a claim by another person attempting to enforce the note.

Pleading Standards of Mortgage Foreclosure Complaints

If Plaintiff seeks to enforce a negotiable instrument pursuant to I.C. §26-1-3.1-101 *et seq.*, then the following “best practices” should apply with respect to the complaint:

- Plaintiff should specify the subsection of §26-1-3.1-301 on which it bases its assertion that it is a “person entitled to enforce” the instrument;
- If Plaintiff alleges that it is a “person entitled to enforce” the instrument under §26-1-3.1-301(1) or (2) because it is either the holder of the instrument (under §26-1-1-201(20)) or a transferee (under §26-1-3.1-203), then counsel should, prior to commencing the action, confirm that Plaintiff possesses the original instrument and can produce the original note in a timely manner if requested by the Court;
- If Plaintiff alleges that it is a “person entitled to enforce” the instrument under §26-1-3.1-301(1) because it is the holder of the instrument and is not the original payee, then its counsel should attach a copy of the instrument, including the endorsements showing the instrument is endorsed to bearer, in blank, or specially to Plaintiff;
- If Plaintiff alleges that it is a “person entitled to enforce” the instrument under §26-1-3.1-301(2) because it is the transferee of the instrument, then its counsel should include in the complaint an assertion that the instrument has not been endorsed to Plaintiff but has been transferred to Plaintiff for the purpose of giving Plaintiff the right to enforce the instrument.
- If Plaintiff maintains that it is a “person entitled to enforce” the instrument under §§26-1-3.1-301(3) and 26-1.3.1-309 because the original instrument has been lost, then counsel should attach as an Exhibit to the Complaint an affidavit setting forth the assertions required by §26-1-3.1-309.
- As an attachment to the Complaint, Plaintiff should provide a service list, including the name, address, and, if available, the telephone number and/or email address for each individual defendant debtor who signed the mortgage. Because many defendant debtors have been and continue to be targeted by illegal foreclosure “rescue agencies”, this service list should comport with the public access exclusions of Administrative Rule 9(H)(1).

Settlement Conferences:

- All courts should send a separate communication to each mortgage foreclosure defendant alerting them to their right to a settlement conference and directing them to contact the Court for further information. The notice sent by the lender as required by the statute does not routinely generate an appreciable response rate, whereas the single-sheet notice sent by our pilot courts has resulted in a settlement conference request rate of approximately 45 percent.
- If Plaintiff maintains that the Defendant does not qualify for a settlement conference under §§32-30-10.5-8(e)(1), loan secured by a dwelling not the debtor’s primary residence, then Plaintiff’s counsel should attach as an Exhibit to the Complaint an affidavit stating that the debtor does not personally reside at such address. If counsel cannot provide such evidence, the debtor should be sent a copy of the “Get Help – Get Hope” form prescribed by §§32-30-10.5-8(c).
- If Plaintiff maintains that the Defendant does not qualify for a settlement conference under §§ 32-30-10.5-8(e)(2), default of a prior foreclosure prevention agreement under this chapter, then its counsel should attach as an Exhibit to the Complaint a copy of the foreclosure prevention agreement and a record of payments substantiating default.
- If Defendant requests a settlement conference under §§32-30-10.5-9, no dispositive motions should be filed until a settlement conference report from Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s), or a court-appointed facilitator has been filed with the court.

- If Defendant requests a settlement conference under §§32-30-10.5-9, the court shall treat this request as an appearance in accordance with T.R. 3-1(B).
- If, at the settlement conference, the parties commence discussions regarding loss mitigation alternatives and conclude that additional information or documentation should be exchanged, then cause exists pursuant to §32-30-10.5-10(b) to reconvene the settlement conference at a later date, and dispositive motions should not be considered pursuant to §32-30-10.5-9 until the settlement conference report has been submitted to the Court by the Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s), or a court-appointed facilitator.

Sanctions

- If either party fails to attend the settlement conference or fails to abide by other court directives, appropriate sanctions may be considered. Judges in St. Joseph and Allen counties have levied sanctions ranging from \$150 to \$2,500 on plaintiffs who failed to attend a settlement conference or who refused to provide documents as requested by the court-appointed facilitator. A homeowner defendant who fails to attend the settlement conference may be perceived as waiving his or her right to a settlement conference, and the foreclosure should proceed as otherwise allowed by law.
- Defendant should not be asked by Plaintiff to waive his or her right to a settlement conference. Such action on the Plaintiff's behalf may be considered a sanctionable offense.
- Monetary sanctions collected by the court under this statute may be made payable to the Mortgage Foreclosure Fund, to support the efforts of pilot court facilitators. Checks should be remitted to the Indiana Housing & Community Development Authority, 30 S. Meridian Street, Suite 1000, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (Attn: Stephanie Reeve).

Post-Judgment

- Any motion to set aside a mortgage foreclosure judgment should state the reason for the request. The borrowers/homeowner should be sent notice of the request. A petition to set aside a judgment that attempts to reinstate the loan should be allowed because of reinstatement or modification of the loan or other foreclosure prevention or loss mitigation agreement.
- A party seeking to file a supplemental affidavit or substitute a previously filed affidavit must file a motion stating the grounds for the substitution. The motion should be noticed to all parties, including previously defaulted parties, and set for hearing.